

**INDOT 2030 Plan Update Early Coordination Meeting Notes**  
**Evansville (EUTS) Meeting at the Vincennes District Offices**  
**Thursday, June 17, 2004 1:30 PM to 3:00 PM**

**In Attendance:** Rose Zigenfus, EUTS Executive Director  
Pamela Drach, EUTS Chief Transportation Engineer  
Seyed Shokouhzadeh, Chief Transportation Planner  
Dale Lucas, Development Engineer - Vincennes District  
John Curry, Program Development Engineer – Vincennes District  
Steve Smith, Manager – Long Range Transportation Planning Section  
Jay Mitchell, Planner – Long Range Transportation Planning Section

**OVERVIEW:** The purpose of the meeting was to provide the Evansville Urban Transportation Study (EUTS), the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Evansville urbanized area, with early input into the development of the 2004 INDOT Long-Range Plan update. The meeting involved a review of the 2030 No-Build E+C Network LOS and the 2030 Build Network LOS output from the Statewide Model. This was used to assist in the determination of the locations of predicted deficiencies in the future 2030 statewide highway system. Existing projects currently listed in the plan were reviewed in order to determine if any should be modified or removed from the plan. In conjunction with the review of potential future deficiencies, the merits of potential new expansion projects were discussed.

**PROJECT EVALUATION DISCUSSION:**

1. LRP Project ID #79 Added Travel Lanes on SR 57 from US 41 to I-164: The MPO stressed the importance and need for this project.

***Comment:** It was agreed that this project would remain listed in the Long-Range Plan under its current “placeholder” status. The goal is to have this project completed and open to traffic by the year 2025 as listed in the EUTS Plan.*

2. US 41 from I-64 in Vanderburgh County to Kings Mine Interchange in Gibson County: The MPO concurs with the district in stressing the need for added travel lanes along this segment of US 41. It was noted that the INDOT Long-Range Plan does list a series of added travel lanes projects through Evansville from I-164 to I-64. However, there is only a reconstruction project in the schedules for part of the segment to the Kings Mine interchange. Some discussion centered upon problems with the intersection immediately north of I-64. Several truck stops have been built in the area resulting in increased congestion.

***Comment:** The Planning Section was not prepared to advance an added travel lanes project for this segment of US 41. The Pre-Engineering Section had evaluated parts of US 41 near I-64 and determined that added travel lanes were not warranted. However, it was agreed that the Interchange at I-64 and US 41 should be re-evaluated in the new*

*Interchange Study. It was also noted that the 2030 Build Network indicated some operational problems near some of the intersections along this segment of US 41 that would merit further review. In the meantime, the both the District and the MPO will continue to monitor any changes the traffic volumes along US 41.*

*NOTE: It should be noted that in a post-meeting follow-up, EUTS did not concur with the Planning Section on this matter and continues to strongly advocate and stress the need for added travel lanes on U.S. 41 from I-64 to the Kings Mine Interchange.*

3. SR 61 Boonville: It was noted that the EUTS Plan lists a project to correct congestion problems on SR 61 on the square in Boonville.

**Comment:** *The Planning Section advised that a Boonville SR 61 “placeholder” project would be included in the updated Long-Range Plan pending the outcome of a SR 61 Boonville environmental assessments (EA) study which was currently underway for the project.*

4. I-164 added travel lanes from the new Ohio River Bridge to I-64: The MPO has placed in its plan update an added travel lanes project on I-164 from the location of the new (I-69) Ohio River bridge to I-64 for the year 2030. INDOT’s analysis shows that I-164 will have sufficient capacity (even with the full-build of I-69) through the year 2025. By the year 2030, the EUTS model predicts that the level of service (LOS) for this segment will decline to “D” and “F” in some parts.

**Comment:** *The Planning Section has reviewed the EUTS model output relative to the output of the Statewide Model and it has determined that a “placeholder” project will be entered into the Long Range Plan update for this segment of I-164 for the fifth funding period of the plan (2025 to 2030).*

5. A new Interchange at Millersburg Road and I-164 on the east side of Evansville: EUTS has identified I-164 and Millersburg Road as a location for a future interchange. The project has been placed in the EUTS Long-Range Plan.

**Comment:** *The Planning Section believes that more study is needed before the potential Millersburg Road interchange can be entered into the INDOT Long Range Plan. The location will be entered into the INDOT Interchange Study update as a location for a possible interchange. The Interchange Study will conduct a detailed evaluation of the location to determine if a purpose and need will exist for a new interchange and EUTS will be asked to participate and provide input into the evaluation of the Millersburg location as a planning partner. The Planning Section will then incorporate the findings of the interchange study into its next plan update.*

6. LRP Projects 51 and 52 (Added Travel Lanes on SR 62 from Chandler to Boonville in Warrick County): The MPO pointed out that with the expansion of its MPA planning area to cover all of Warrick County, these two projects need to be amended to reflect the fact that they are located within an MPO’s planning area.

**Comment:** The Planning Section concurs with the MPO and both projects #51 and #52 will be amended to reflect the fact that they fall within the Evansville Metropolitan Planning Area.

7. LRP Project 75 the Newburgh Truck Bypass: EUTS said that they have removed this project from their plan update and that they recommend that INDOT do the same.

**Comment:** Since EUTS has already removed the project from its updated 2030 plan, the Planning Section has agreed to remove the project from the INDOT Long-Range Plan update subject to approval from the Executive Office. Since the project is part of a long-standing relinquishment agreement, the project's DES number (9607710) will remain active in the INDOT scheduling system until such time as all of the signatories to the original relinquishment agreement have formally agreed to any terms that would change the scope of the project or cause it to be deleted from the INDOT scheduling system.

8. SR 66 from SR 165 on the west side of Wadesville in Posey County to the Posey/Vanderburgh County Line: Both the 2030 No-Build E+C and the 2030 Build Networks indicate a poor level of service "E" for parts of this segment of roadway. The District and the MPO concurred that added capacity would be warranted for this segment of roadway in the future.

**Comment:** The Planning Section agreed that this segment merits a closer look and that it may become a candidate for inclusion into the Long-Range Plan update.

9. Western Mt. Vernon Connector: EUTS is recommending that a west-side SR 69 connector be included in the INDOT Long Range Plan update.

**Comment:** The Planning Section noted that the last cost estimate (approximately 4 years old) for a west-side Mt Vernon SR 69 connector was nearly \$19 million. Mt. Vernon also falls outside of the EUTS Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) boundary. Since such a project would represent a major transportation investment, additional planning studies are needed prior to inclusion in the INDOT Long-Range Plan.

10. SR 64 Princeton Bypass in their 2030 Regional Transportation Plan for Gibson County, EUTS is recommending that CR 150/Heights Chapel Road be widened to four lanes from US 41 to SR 64. They also recommend that SR 64 be reconstructed with added travel lanes from CR 150 to the new I-69. This would create a 4-lane connection between US 41 and the new I-69 south of Princeton.

**Comment:** Princeton and Gibson County fall outside of the EUTS Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) boundary. There already exists an \$11 million dollar (LRP ID #736, DES #8915400) project that will add travel lanes on SR 64 through the City of Princeton. Both the 2030 No-Build E+C and the 2030 Build Networks show a level of "B" and "C" for SR 64 east of Princeton which indicate that no major improvements, notwithstanding safety improvements would be warranted. The Planning Section is not

*yet prepared to advance a Princeton Bypass project. However, portions of SR 64 to the west of I-69 will most probably be evaluated in conjunction with the I-69 TIER II studies.*

11. LRP Project 60 added travel lanes on SR 261 from SR 66 to Jenner Road in Warrick County: It was noted by both EUTS and by the District that there is rapid growth, primarily residential growth, in this area. The MPO supports extending this project northward. The District concurs and would like to see the project extended to SR 62.

***Comment:*** *The Planning Section noted that they had agreed with the District and that the suggestion would be taken under advisement pending consultation with the Pre-engineering section.*

12. LRP Project 647 Placeholder for I-69 Henderson to Evansville: EUTS noted that this project is listed in the INDOT Long-Range Plan as ready-for-contract (RFC) in 2017 and that it is listed in the EUTS plan as “open-to-traffic” by 2015. EUTS pointed out that an air quality conformity analysis of the EUTS 2030 plan was successfully run with the 2015 open-to-traffic date for this project. To move the open to traffic date would require a new air quality conformity analysis.

***Comment:*** *The Planning Section explained that this project was placed into the plan as a “placeholder” in the early stages of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review process. The various alternatives, description, costs and RFC date were based on the best available information at the time of publication. Since that time, the project has progressed from 14 alternatives to 1 “preferred” alternative. More detailed information regarding the project and its cost is now available. The Plan update process will provide an opportunity to revise the RFC/open-to-traffic dates and to reconcile the EUTS plan and the INDOT plan.*